

EXHIBIT B



2020 Partner Compensation Survey

JEFFREY A. LOWE, ESQ.

Global Practice Leader, Law Firm Practice
Managing Partner, Washington, D.C.



2020 Partner Compensation Survey

JEFFREY A. LOWE, ESQ.
Global Practice Leader, Law Firm Practice
Managing Partner, Washington, D.C.

Table of Contents

BACKGROUND.....	4
THE SURVEY	7
METHODOLOGY	8
STATISTICAL TERMS USED	9
KEY FINDINGS.....	10
IMPACT OF COVID-19 ON COMPENSATION.....	10
Impact for 2020	14
EXHIBIT 1.1 ORIGINAL EXPECTED IMPACTS ON 2020 COMPENSATION.....	15
Partnership Tenure and Partnership Status	15
Practice Area.....	15
City	16
Compensation Transparency and Lockstep Type	16
Gender and Ethnicity	16
COMPENSATION, ORIGINATIONS, RECEIPTS, BILLING RATES AND HOURS	17
COMPENSATION	17
Partnership Tenure and Partnership Status	17
EXHIBIT 2.1 – AVERAGE TOTAL COMPENSATION BY PARTNER TENURE	18
EXHIBIT 2.2 – AVERAGE TOTAL COMPENSATION BY PARTNERSHIP STATUS.....	18
Practice Area.....	19
EXHIBIT 2.3 – AVERAGE TOTAL COMPENSATION BY PRACTICE AREA	19
City	19
EXHIBIT 2.4 – AVERAGE TOTAL COMPENSATION BY CITY	20
Compensation Transparency and Lockstep Type	20
EXHIBIT 2.5 – AVERAGE TOTAL COMPENSATION BY COMPENSATION TRANSPARENCY	21
EXHIBIT 2.6 – AVERAGE TOTAL COMPENSATION BY LOCKSTEP TYPE	21
Gender and Ethnicity	22
EXHIBIT 2.7 – AVERAGE TOTAL COMPENSATION BY GENDER	22
EXHIBIT 2.8 – AVERAGE TOTAL COMPENSATION BY ETHNICITY	23

ORIGINATIONS	24
Partnership Tenure and Partnership Status	24
EXHIBIT 3.1 – AVERAGE ORIGINATIONS BY PARTNERSHIP TENURE	24
EXHIBIT 3.2 – AVERAGE ORIGINATIONS BY PARTNERSHIP STATUS.....	25
Practice Area.....	25
EXHIBIT 3.3 – AVERAGE ORIGINATIONS BY PRACTICE AREA	25
City	26
EXHIBIT 3.4 – AVERAGE ORIGINATIONS BY CITY	26
Compensation Transparency and Lockstep Type	27
EXHIBIT 3.5 – AVERAGE ORIGINATIONS BY COMPENSATION TRANSPARENCY	27
EXHIBIT 3.6 – AVERAGE ORIGINATIONS BY LOCKSTEP TYPE	27
Gender and Ethnicity	27
EXHIBIT 3.7 – AVERAGE ORIGINATIONS BY GENDER.....	28
EXHIBIT 3.8 – AVERAGE ORIGINATIONS BY ETHNICITY	29
WORKING ATTORNEY RECEIPTS	29
BILLING RATES, DISCOUNTS, BILLABLE HOURS AND NON-BILLABLE HOURS	30
EXHIBIT 4.1 – AVERAGE BILLING RATE BY FIRM SIZE.....	30
EXHIBIT 4.2 – AVERAGE BILLABLE HOURS BY FIRM SIZE.....	31
EXHIBIT 4.3 – AVERAGE NON-BILLABLE HOURS BY FIRM SIZE	31
COMPENSATION SATISFACTION	34
Satisfaction Ratings.....	34
EXHIBIT 5.1A – OVERALL SATISFACTION WITH TOTAL COMPENSATION (2020).....	34
EXHIBIT 5.1B – OVERALL SATISFACTION WITH TOTAL COMPENSATION (2018)	34
Partnership Tenure and Partnership Status	35
EXHIBIT 5.2A – SATISFACTION BY PARTNERSHIP TENURE (2020).....	35
EXHIBIT 5.2B – SATISFACTION BY PARTNERSHIP TENURE (2018)	35
EXHIBIT 5.3 A– SATISFACTION BY PARTNERSHIP STATUS (2020).....	36
EXHIBIT 5.3B – SATISFACTION BY PARTNERSHIP STATUS (2018)	36
Practice Area.....	37
EXHIBIT 5.4A – SATISFACTION BY PRACTICE AREA (2020)	37
EXHIBIT 5.4B – SATISFACTION BY PRACTICE AREA (2018).....	37

City	38
EXHIBIT 5.5A – SATISFACTION BY CITY (2020)	38
EXHIBIT 5.5B – SATISFACTION BY CITY (2018)	38
Compensation Transparency and Lateral Status.....	39
EXHIBIT 5.6A – SATISFACTION BY COMPENSATION TRANSPARENCY (2020)	39
EXHIBIT 5.6B – SATISFACTION BY COMPENSATION TRANSPARENCY (2018).....	39
EXHIBIT 5.7A – SATISFACTION BY LATERAL STATUS (2020).....	39
EXHIBIT 5.7B – SATISFACTION BY LATERAL STATUS (2018)	39
Total Compensation, Total Originations and Billable Hours	40
EXHIBIT 5.8A – SATISFACTION BY TOTAL COMPENSATION (2020).....	40
EXHIBIT 5.8B – SATISFACTION BY TOTAL COMPENSATION (2018)	40
EXHIBIT 5.9A – SATISFACTION BY TOTAL ORIGINATIONS (2020)	41
EXHIBIT 5.9B – SATISFACTION BY TOTAL ORIGINATIONS (2018)	41
EXHIBIT 5.10A – SATISFACTION BY BILLABLE HOURS (2020)	42
EXHIBIT 5.10B – SATISFACTION BY BILLABLE HOURS (2018)	42
Gender and Ethnicity	43
EXHIBIT 5.11B – SATISFACTION BY GENDER (2018)	43
EXHIBIT 5.12A – SATISFACTION BY ETHNICITY (2020)	44
EXHIBIT 5.12B – SATISFACTION BY ETHNICITY (2018).....	45
NOTES	46
About The Author	46
About Major, Lindsey & Africa	46
About Acritas	46
APPENDICES.....	47
I – Respondent Profile.....	48
II – Impact of COVID-19.....	52
III – Average Total Compensation	55
IV – Average Total Originations	57
V – Average Total Working Attorney Receipts	59
VI – Average Billing Rates	61
VII – Average Billable Hours.....	63
VIII – Average Non-Billable Hours.....	65
IX – Satisfaction with Total Compensation.....	67
QUESTIONNAIRE.....	75

BACKGROUND

In the summer of 2020, Major, Lindsey & Africa (MLA) launched its 2020 Partner Compensation Survey in partnership with Acritas (part of Thomson Reuters). The Survey, which was sent independently by Acritas to almost 50,000 law firm partners in AmLaw 200-size firms across the United States, was the sixth in a series of groundbreaking, biennial surveys begun by MLA in 2010. The MLA Partner Compensation Survey continues to be the most comprehensive effort ever undertaken to identify ranges of partner compensation, the criteria law firms use in determining partner compensation, and the satisfaction of law firm partners with their compensation and compensation systems.

Given the enormous changes brought about this year by the COVID-19 pandemic, we felt it was more important than ever to continue with the Survey so that we may better understand the pandemic's short-term and long-term impact on partner compensation and satisfaction. Accordingly, this year's Survey also included several new questions relating to the pandemic's effects on partners' draws, base compensation, bonuses and capital contributions. However, mindful of the increased time pressures faced by partners as a result of the pandemic, we shortened other aspects of the 2020 Survey to make it easier to complete, with a greater focus on core metrics. We intend to return to the full Survey in 2022.

This Report provides (i) an overview of the Survey, (ii) the demographic breakdown of the respondents to the Survey, (iii) the impact and expected impact of COVID-19 on 2020 compensation, (iv) selected highlights of compensation and other practice metrics as reported by the respondents, and (v) selected highlights of compensation satisfaction as reported by the respondents.

THE SURVEY

The Survey consisted of 20 questions (including demographic questions), with the results broken down into four major categories:

1. Demographic information about each respondent and the respondent's law firm, including:

- Partnership Tenure
- Partnership Status (i.e., Equity vs. Non-Equity)
- Primary Practice Area
- City
- Lateral Status (i.e., "Homegrown" vs. Lateral)
- Compensation Transparency (i.e., Open vs. Closed compensation system)
- Compensation System (i.e., Lockstep vs. Non-lockstep)
- Age
- Gender
- Sexual orientation
- Ethnicity

2. Objective information about a respondent's compensation and practice metrics for 2019, including:

- Total compensation
- Total originations
- Total working attorney receipts
- Standard hourly billing rate and discount
- Total billable hours
- Total non-billable hours

3. Optional questions about the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on compensation, including:

- Percentage impact/expected impact on draw, base compensation, bonuses and capital contributions

4. Subjective information about a respondent's perception of his or her satisfaction with their total compensation.

METHODOLOGY

This Survey was sponsored and developed by Major, Lindsey & Africa (MLA) in association with Acritas (part of Thomson Reuters), a legal market intelligence and research specialist. By having all correspondence and Survey responses go through Acritas, MLA enabled all respondents to answer confidentially and anonymously. At no time was MLA made aware of respondents' names or firms, either individually or in the aggregate.

Data for this Survey were collected using an online questionnaire hosted by Acritas. Invitations were emailed to 48,883 partners across the United States at Am Law 200-ranked firms. The emailed invitation contained a link which partners could use to access the Survey online. The Survey was open between July 29, 2020, and September 21, 2020. To maximize the response rate, three email reminders, each spaced one to two weeks apart, were also sent.

The recipient list was sourced through an aggregated and vetted online attorney database. A minority of respondents also participated after being notified of the Survey through MLA's own LinkedIn campaign, or via direct invitation from MLA. The questionnaire was developed by MLA and reviewed by Acritas. As an incentive to complete the Survey, respondents were advised that MLA had agreed to make a donation to The Legal Aid Society for each respondent who completed the Survey. Additionally, partners who participated became eligible to receive a \$1,500 American Express gift card, which was to be awarded to one respondent who completed the Survey before its close. Acritas randomly selected one respondent to receive this prize after the Survey closed.

A total of 1,271 responses were received from partners practicing across the United States. 165 of the initial emails were returned as undeliverable. Assuming that all remaining partners contacted received the invitation, the overall response rate was 2.21%.

As is customary with surveys of this nature, not every respondent answered every question.

Each data table notes the actual number of respondents for each category. In order to present the data meaningfully, in certain cases individual respondents were grouped into larger categories.

In Questions 8 through 13 of the Survey, respondents were given ranges as response choices. For example, total compensation values were typically grouped in \$50,000 ranges (e.g., \$800,000 to \$850,000). In order to calculate the data for this Report, Acritas used, wherever possible, the midpoint for all responses that were expressed as ranges. In those cases where midpoints were not identifiable (e.g., responses where one parameter of the range was open-ended), Acritas and MLA jointly agreed on values to be used for those responses, applying consistent criteria to previous surveys.

In order to protect respondents' identities, this Report does not disclose any information about any individual or any individual law firm. All information is reported in the aggregate to ensure anonymity. Acritas did not provide the names, email addresses or any other identifying information of individual respondents or any law firm to MLA. At all times, MLA remained blind to the specific sources of the data.

In many instances, this Report compares the results of the 2020 Survey with those of the 2018 Survey. However, it is important to note that prior editions of the Survey were targeted to a broader range of partners (e.g., not only partners at AmLaw 200-size firms, but also those at NLJ 350- and Global 100-size firms). Consequently, Acritas has normalized the 2018 data for the sections of this Report covering Questions 8 through 13 of the Survey (total compensation, total originations, total working attorney receipts, standard hourly billing rate and discount, total billable hours and total non-billable hours) to include only the data from 2018 respondents at AmLaw 200 firms in order to make these comparisons more meaningful. The complete results of the 2018 Survey can be found by clicking [here](#).

*For a detailed profile of the Survey respondents, please refer to **Appendix I – Respondent Profile**.*

STATISTICAL TERMS USED

The statistical terms used in the Report are defined below.

- The median (or the 50th percentile) is the middle or central number in a series of numbers arranged in order of value. There are equal numbers of smaller and larger observations.
- The average (or mean) is the total value of all observations divided by the number of observations.
- Percentages may not total 100 because of decimal places/rounding.



Key Findings

IMPACT OF COVID-19 ON COMPENSATION

70% of respondents reported that they expected COVID-19 to impact their 2020 compensation in some way. However, subsequent to the launch of the Survey in July 2020 and up through the drafting of this Report, many firms began to announce either full or partial restoration of austerity measures (if any) taken by those firms as a result of the pandemic, while others announced further cutbacks. In some instances, firms rolled back some austerity measures while implementing additional cutbacks, particularly for non-timekeeper staff.¹ Over the course of the summer and into early fall, it became clear that the industry was faring far better than anyone expected during the early part of the pandemic. In fact, by late summer, some firms started indicating that they were even outperforming their strong results from 2019.

Given the fluidity of the situation, MLA independently conducted a mini “flash survey” in November 2020 of the same pool of participants as those invited to participate in the main Survey. Nearly two-thirds of the 134 respondents to the flash survey reported that they did not expect their 2020 compensation to be affected by the pandemic, and of those respondents whose firms enacted austerity measures at the start of the pandemic, 43% reported those austerity measures being reversed completely and 41% reported those measures being reversed in part.

Accordingly, we believe it is important for readers of this Report to understand that the discussion of COVID-19 in this Report should be viewed in the historical context of how partners were expecting their compensation to be affected by COVID-19 during the initial wave of the pandemic, rather than what partners subsequently expected or actually experienced.

COMPENSATION

- Average compensation for all partners was \$1,054,000, up 10% from 2018 (\$962,000). Median compensation has also increased since 2018 (\$625,000 to \$675,000).
- Equity partners continue to average more than three times the total compensation of their Non-Equity colleagues (\$1,390,000 vs. \$432,000). However, for the first time since conducting the Survey, Equity and Non-Equity partners saw similar percentage gains in compensation over 2018: Average compensation for Equity partners rose by 12%, from \$1,244,000 to \$1,390,000, while Non-Equity partner compensation rose by 11%, from \$388,000 to \$432,000. Median compensation for Non-Equity partners increased from \$325,000 to \$375,000 (+15%), and for Equity partners it increased from \$875,000 to \$975,000 (+11%).
- As in our prior Surveys, male partners’ average compensation continues to significantly outpace that of female partners’ (\$1,130,000 vs. \$784,000), though female partners’ compensation rose at over twice the rate of male partners’ (+15% vs 7%). The average male partner’s total compensation is 44% more than the average female partner’s, down from the 53% differential reported in our 2018 Survey and in line with the 44% differential reported in 2016.
- The average total compensation for those identifying with a non-White ethnicity is 20% lower than that of White (not Hispanic) partners (\$1,046,000 vs. \$869,000). Black (not Hispanic) partners reported a 78% increase in compensation, followed by a 16% increase for Asian Pacific (not Hispanic) partners and an 11% increase for White (not Hispanic) partners. Hispanic partners were the only category to report a decline (-18%).

¹ For a more complete discussion, please see <https://www.law.com/americanlawyer/2020/10/22/adjusting-the-covid-19-response-how-law-firms-are-altering-austerity-measures/>.

- Among the seven practice areas grouped for purposes of this Report, Labor & Employment partners continue to report the lowest average total compensation (\$667,000) and are the only group to actually report a decline from 2018 (\$735,000; -9%). Tax & ERISA partners reported the highest total compensation (\$1,371,000) and the highest percentage increase (+32%) over 2018. Corporate partners were next highest (\$1,282,000), up slightly (+1%) from 2018. IP partners also recorded a significant increase in total compensation, rising 29% to \$1,102,000. Litigation and Real Estate partners saw more modest gains of 14% and 10%, respectively.
- The disparity in compensation among cities continues to be pronounced. Average total compensation ranged from a low of \$650,000 in Atlanta to a high of \$1,658,000 in Palo Alto/Silicon Valley and \$1,639,000 in New York. As in 2018, most major cities saw increases, with the exception of Dallas (-32%) and Atlanta (-11%). Palo Alto/Silicon Valley (+40%), Miami (+31%), Philadelphia (+29%) and Boston (+24%) showed the largest gains.
- As in our prior Surveys, partners in Open compensation systems reported significantly higher average compensation (\$1,218,000; +14%) compared to partners in Partially Open and Closed systems, and were the only group to report an increase in compensation. Average compensation for partners in Partially Open systems declined 1% to \$909,000, and partners in Closed systems saw an 8% decline, to \$694,000.

ORIGINATIONS

- Average originations for all partners were \$2,874,000, up 3% from \$2,805,000 in 2018. Median originations remained flat at \$1,450,000. Equity partners and Non-Equity partners both reported increases in average originations (\$4,001,000; +6% and \$859,000; +7%, respectively). Thus, Equity partners continue to originate more than four times the amount of business generated by Non-Equity partners, which is consistent with each of our previous Surveys. At the high end, Corporate partners reported average originations of \$3,982,000 (+1%), and, on the low end, Labor & Employment partners reported \$1,579,000 in originations (a decrease of 13% from 2018).
- Male partners continue to significantly outpace female partners in originations. Male partners reported average originations of \$3,116,000, representing a 2% gain over 2018. Female partners, however, after posting an 8% decrease in originations between 2016 and 2018, reported a 19% increase, with average originations of \$2,102,000.
- White (not Hispanic) partners averaged \$2,888,000 in originations (+6%). Originations for non-White partners were significantly lower (\$2,259,000). Black (not Hispanic) partners reported a 33% increase in originations, followed by a 27% increase for Asian Pacific (not Hispanic) partners and a 6% increase for White (not Hispanic) partners. Hispanic partners were the only category to report a decline (-17%).²

² The ethnic categories used in the Survey and this Report track those previously used by the American Bar Association. The number of respondents by ethnic category was as follows: White, not Hispanic (931), Black, not Hispanic (47), Hispanic (70), Asian Pacific, not Hispanic (69), American Indian, not Hispanic (0), Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, not Hispanic (1), Mixed Races (18). Historically, because of the relatively small number of non-White respondents, it has been difficult to draw statistically meaningful conclusions for those categories. This is also true with regard to other sections of this Report, especially where data is sorted by City, as the fewer the number of respondents, the more susceptible the numbers are to sampling variation. However, we are delighted by the large increase in responses from respondents in the non-White categories and would like to thank the leadership and members of the National Bar Association, the Asian Pacific American Bar Association, the National Hispanic Bar Association and the Diverse Partners Network for promoting the Survey to their members. We look forward to sharing additional data and commentary with these organizations and the entire legal community.

BILLING RATES AND HOURS

- The average billing rate for all respondents was \$827, up \$65 (+9%) from 2018. The gap in billing rates between Equity and Non-Equity partners is much smaller than their compensation gap (\$902 vs. \$689, or a 30% difference in billing rates vs. a 322% difference in compensation). Both groups' average billing rates rose 9% over 2018.
- 37% of partners do not provide a standard discount off their hourly billing rate. Of those who do, the majority give a discount of 15% or less. Only 9% of all partners provide a discount above this figure.
- The average billed time for all partners was 1,680 hours, which is in line with the 2018, 2016 and 2014 averages (1,683, 1,686 and 1,687 hours, respectively), and non-billed time averaged 590 hours, virtually flat with 2018 (589). As in previous years, the level of compensation positively correlates with the number of billable and non-billable hours.

COMPENSATION SATISFACTION

- Partners' satisfaction with their compensation was robust: 25% classified themselves as Very Satisfied with their current compensation, 39% classified themselves as Moderately Satisfied and 11% as Slightly Satisfied. Conversely, 6% classified themselves as Slightly Dissatisfied, 8% as Moderately Dissatisfied and 5% as Very Dissatisfied. 7% felt Neutral. These numbers reflect an increase in satisfaction and a decrease in dissatisfaction across every measure.
- Nonetheless, the gap between Equity partners' and Non-Equity partners' compensation satisfaction remains wide and is growing, with 32% of Equity partners Very Satisfied compared to 12% of Non-Equity partners, up from 27% and 11%, respectively, in 2018. Conversely, Non-Equity partners were three times as likely to classify themselves as Very Dissatisfied (10% vs. 3%).
- Analyzing the data by Practice Area, Real Estate partners were most likely to classify themselves as Very Satisfied with their compensation (31%), a sharp rise from 13% in 2018, followed by IP partners at 30%, up from 23% in 2018. Tax & ERISA partners reported the next sharpest rise, with 28% classifying themselves as Very Satisfied compared to 18% in 2018. Tax & ERISA partners had the highest proportion of Satisfied partners overall (78%), followed closely by Labor & Employment and Real Estate partners (76% each). In contrast to 2018, every practice had more than 70% of their respondents classifying themselves in one of the Satisfied categories.
- Palo Alto/Silicon Valley had the highest level of partners classifying themselves as Very Satisfied with their compensation (38%), followed by San Francisco (30%). At the other end of the spectrum, only 16% of Philadelphia-based partners reported that they are Very Satisfied. Boston and Washington, D.C./Northern Virginia had the highest proportion of partners selecting one of the Satisfied choices (88% and 83%, respectively). Philadelphia had the highest proportion of partners falling into one of the Dissatisfied categories (35%), followed by Chicago (28%) and Atlanta (24%).
- 24% of female partners reported they were Very Satisfied with their compensation, compared to 25% of male partners – a reduction in the gap from 2018 (19% vs. 23%). At the opposite end, a higher proportion of female partners placed themselves in one of the Dissatisfied categories (24% vs. 17% of males), both of which represent decreases from 2018 (33% and 24%, respectively).

- Although White (not Hispanic) partners once again were most likely to classify themselves in one of the Satisfied categories, all other ethnicities showed strong gains overall compared to 2018. However, Black (not Hispanic) partners were the only group to show a decrease in partners describing themselves as Very Satisfied with their compensation, decreasing from 17% in 2018 to 15% in 2020. Conversely, Black (not Hispanic) partners also showed the greatest decrease (by far) in partners describing themselves as Very Dissatisfied, falling from 17% in 2018 to 4% in 2020.



VI – Average Billing Rates

PARTNERSHIP TENURE

	2018 cc	2018	2020	2020 Frequency
1 - 5 years	\$683	\$644	\$724	326
6 - 10 years	\$733	\$691	\$827	239
11 - 20 years	\$778	\$734	\$867	343
More than 20 years	\$830	\$781	\$884	358

COMPENSATION TRANSPARENCY

	2018 cc	2018	2020	2020 Frequency
Open	\$773	\$734	\$861	801
Partially Open	\$792	\$759	\$839	168
Closed	\$726	\$663	\$729	294

COMPENSATION SYSTEM

	2018 cc	2018	2020	2020 Frequency
Pure Lockstep	\$658	\$735	\$1,009	14
Generally Lockstep	\$727	\$696	\$785	193
Not Lockstep at all	\$770	\$723	\$833	1,051

PARTNERSHIP STATUS

	2018 cc	2018	2020	2020 Frequency
Equity Partner	\$825	\$775	\$902	825
Non-Equity Partner	\$631	\$599	\$689	442

CITY

	2018 cc	2018	2020	2020 Frequency
New York	\$999	\$994	\$1,088	181
DC / NoVA	\$897	\$885	\$988	171
Chicago	\$779	\$736	\$821	121
Los Angeles	\$834	\$777	\$933	85
San Francisco	\$862	\$833	\$907	62
Philadelphia	\$675	\$618	\$717	32
Boston	\$879	\$841	\$969	50
Atlanta	\$642	\$625	\$634	43
Dallas	\$833	\$793	\$817	46
Houston	\$813	\$785	\$880	31
Silicon Valley	\$872	\$873	\$1,051	33
Minneapolis	\$620	\$550	\$617	26
Seattle	\$672	\$653	\$692	31
Miami	\$656	\$658	\$739	27
Other	\$567	\$541	\$585	327

PRACTICE AREA

	2018 cc	2018	2020	2020 Frequency
Litigation	\$703	\$640	\$770	293
Corporate	\$857	\$820	\$901	267
IP	\$732	\$715	\$868	141
Labor & Employment	\$617	\$596	\$656	87
Tax & ERISA	\$873	\$831	\$1,041	66
Real Estate	\$719	\$681	\$754	63
Other	\$779	\$734	\$820	348

GENDER

	2018 cc	2018	2020	2020 Frequency
Male	\$786	\$736	\$841	811
Female	\$696	\$650	\$766	352

ETHNICITY

	2018 cc	2018	2020	2020 Frequency
White, not Hispanic	\$755	\$705	\$822	929
Black, not Hispanic	\$638	\$635	\$797	47
Hispanic	\$708	\$691	\$698	70
Asian Pacific, not Hispanic	\$842	\$769	\$862	69
American Indian, not Hispanic	\$387	\$387	NA	0
Native Hawaiian or Pacific	\$362	\$612	\$287	1
Mixed races	\$696	\$692	\$865	18

FIRM SIZE

	2018 cc	2018	2020	2020 Frequency
1 - 50 attorneys	NA	NA	\$1,287	1
51 - 200 attorneys	\$602	\$511	\$738	204
201 - 500 attorneys	\$608	\$589	\$840	467
501 - 1,000 attorneys	\$775	\$774	\$883	250
1,000+ attorneys	\$882	\$882	\$891	67

2020 Major, Lindsey & Africa Partner Compensation Survey

Thank you for taking part in the 2020 Major, Lindsey & Africa Partner Compensation Survey. Major, Lindsey & Africa has commissioned Acritas, a specialist legal market research agency, to administer this survey on its behalf. Your responses will be kept strictly confidential by Acritas and no identifying information will be associated with your answers or forwarded to Major, Lindsey & Africa or any other party.

Each participant will receive a free copy of the final report. If you are not sure of an answer to a question, please feel free to skip that question.

First, some general questions about your partnership status and practice.

Q1. How many years have you been a partner at a law firm in total? Please include all law firms, including your current one.

- 1 to 5 years
- 6 to 10 years
- 11 to 20 years
- More than 20 years

Q2. What was your Partnership Status during the 2019 compensation year?

For purposes of this survey, Equity Partners are those who receive no more than half their compensation on a fixed-income basis and Non-Equity Partners are those who receive more than half their compensation on a fixed basis. If your status changed during the year, please use your status as of the end of the year.

- | | |
|----------------------|------------------------|
| ➤ Equity Partner | ➤ Not a partner during |
| ➤ Non-Equity Partner | 2019 |

Q3. What is your primary practice area?

- | | | |
|---|------------------------|--|
| ➤ Administrative/
Regulatory | ➤ Employment/Labor | ➤ Litigation – General |
| ➤ Antitrust | ➤ Energy | ➤ Litigation – Appellate |
| ➤ Banking | ➤ Entertainment | ➤ Litigation – White Collar/
Securities Enforcement |
| ➤ Bankruptcy | ➤ Environmental | ➤ Privacy/Cybersecurity |
| ➤ Corporate – General | ➤ ERISA/Benefits | ➤ Project Finance |
| ➤ Corporate – Emerging
Company/Venture
Capital | ➤ Government Contracts | ➤ Real Estate |
| ➤ Corporate – Finance/
Securities/Capital
Markets | ➤ Healthcare | ➤ Tax |
| ➤ Corporate – M&A | ➤ Immigration | ➤ Trusts & Estates |
| | ➤ Insurance | ➤ Other (please specify) |
| | ➤ International | |
| | ➤ IP – Litigation | |
| | ➤ IP – Transactional | |

Q4. In what city do you primarily practice?

- › Akron, OH
- › Albuquerque, NM
- › Arlington, TX
- › Atlanta, GA
- › Austin, TX
- › Baltimore, MD
- › Birmingham, AL
- › Boston, MA
- › Buffalo, NY
- › Charlotte, NC
- › Chicago, IL
- › Cincinnati, OH
- › Cleveland, OH
- › Colorado Springs, CO
- › Columbia, SC
- › Columbus, OH
- › Dallas, TX
- › Denver, CO
- › Detroit, MI
- › El Paso, TX
- › Fort Worth, TX
- › Fresno, CA
- › Greenville, SC
- › Hartford, CT
- › Honolulu, HI
- › Houston, TX
- › Indianapolis, IN
- › Irvine, CA
- › Jacksonville, FL
- › Kansas City, MO
- › Las Vegas, NV
- › Long Beach, CA
- › Los Angeles, CA
- › Louisville, KY
- › Memphis, TN
- › Mesa, AZ
- › Miami, FL
- › Milwaukee, WI
- › Minneapolis, MN
- › Mountain View, CA
- › Nashville, TN
- › New Orleans, LA
- › New York, NY
- › Newark, NJ/Northern NJ
- › Oakland, CA
- › Oklahoma City, OK
- › Omaha, NE
- › Orange County, CA
- › Orlando, FL
- › Palo Alto/Silicon Valley, CA
- › Philadelphia, PA
- › Phoenix, AZ
- › Pittsburgh, PA
- › Portland, OR
- › Providence, RI
- › Raleigh, NC
- › Richmond, VA
- › Sacramento, CA
- › San Antonio, TX
- › San Diego, CA
- › San Francisco, CA
- › San Jose, CA
- › Seattle, WA
- › St. Louis, MO
- › Tallahassee, FL
- › Tampa, FL
- › Tucson, AZ
- › Tulsa, OK
- › Virginia Beach/Tidewater, VA
- › Washington, D.C./NoVA
- › Westchester, NY
- › Winston-Salem, NC
- › Other (please specify)

Q5. Did you join your present firm (i) laterally as a partner from another law firm, (ii) laterally as a partner from government service or private industry, or (iii) were you previously an associate or counsel with your present firm before making partner?

- › I joined my present firm laterally as a partner from another law firm
- › I joined my present firm laterally as a partner from government service or private industry
- › I was previously an associate or counsel with my present firm before making partner

Q6. Is your firm's compensation system an open or closed one, i.e., do partners know what other partners make?

- › Open: Partners know what everyone makes, or can easily find out
- › Partially Open: Partners know ranges of compensation, but do not know exactly who makes what
- › Closed: Partners do not know what anyone else makes

Q7. Is your firm's compensation system pure lockstep, generally lockstep but allows for some variance based on certain factors, or not lockstep at all?

- My firm is pure lockstep
- My firm is generally lockstep, but allows for some variance
- My firm is not lockstep at all

Now some questions about your billing rate, hours, compensation and originations.

Q8. What was your standard hourly billing rate for 2019? If your rate changed, please select the option which reflects the majority of the year.

- Drop down menu of values ranging from "less than \$50" to "\$2,000 or more," in \$25/hour increments.

Q8a. What was your standard discount off your hourly billing rate for 2019?

- | | | |
|------------------------|----------|----------|
| ➤ No standard discount | ➤ 16-20% | ➤ 36-40% |
| ➤ <5% | ➤ 21-25% | ➤ 41-45% |
| ➤ 5-10% | ➤ 26-30% | ➤ 46-50% |
| ➤ 11-15% | ➤ 31-35% | ➤ >50% |

Q9. What were your total billable hours for 2019?

- Drop down menu of values ranging from "less than 1,000 hours" to "3,000 hours or more," in 50-hour increments

Q10. What were your total non-billable hours for 2019?

- Drop down menu of values ranging from "less than 50 hours" to "1,000 hours or more," in 50-hour increments.

Q11. What was your total compensation for 2019 (including base and bonus, but excluding one-time contingency case payments, signing bonuses or other unusual payments that are not likely to re-occur)?

- Drop down menu of values ranging from "less than \$100K" to "\$8M or more," in \$50,000 increments.

OPTIONAL COVID QUESTIONS

Q11a. Was your 2019 total compensation/capital affected by the COVID-19 pandemic?

- Yes
- No

Q11b. How was your 2019 compensation affected? [Check all that apply]

- My draw was reduced by ____% [increment ranges of 5%]
- My base compensation was reduced by ____% [increment ranges of 5%]
- My previously anticipated bonus was reduced by ____% [increment ranges of 5%]
- My capital was increased by ____% [increment ranges of 5%]

Q11c. Is your 2020 compensation/capital expected to be affected by the COVID-19 pandemic?

- Yes
- No

Q11d. How is your 2020 compensation/capital expected to be affected: [Check all that apply]

- My draw was/is expected to be reduced by ____% [increment ranges of 5%]
- My base compensation was/is expected to be reduced by ____% [increment ranges of 5%]
- My previously anticipated bonus was/is expected to be reduced by ____% [increment ranges of 5%]
- My capital was/is expected to be increased by ____% [increment ranges of 5%]

Q12. What were your total originations for 2019? If your firm doesn't track originations, please provide your best estimate if possible. By total originations, we mean the total dollar value of work performed and collected by you and the other attorneys at your firm for which your efforts were the proximate cause of such work coming to the firm.

- Drop down menu of values ranging from "less than \$100K" to "\$30M or more," in \$100,000 increments through \$10M and \$1M increments between \$10-30M; Don't know/not sure.

Q13. What were your total working attorney receipts for 2019?

By total working attorney receipts, we mean the number of dollars collected (or expected to be collected) by your firm for work performed personally by you (e.g., your billable hours multiplied by your billing rate) in a fiscal year, even if it was collected in the following fiscal year. [Please exclude one-time contingency case payments or other unusual payments that are unlikely to re-occur.]

- Drop down menu of values ranging from "less than \$100K" to "\$5M or more," in \$100,000 increments; Don't know/not sure.

Q14. Generally, how satisfied are you with your total compensation?

- Very satisfied
- Neutral
- Very dissatisfied
- Moderately satisfied
- Slightly dissatisfied
- Slightly satisfied
- Moderately dissatisfied

Finally, just a few demographic questions.

Q15. What is your age?

- Drop down menu of values ranging from 20 to over 80

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

Q16. At what age do you expect to retire?

- | | | |
|---------------|------|--------------------------|
| > Prior to 50 | > 61 | > 73 |
| > 50 | > 62 | > 74 |
| > 51 | > 63 | > 75 |
| > 52 | > 64 | > 76 |
| > 53 | > 65 | > 77 |
| > 54 | > 66 | > 78 |
| > 55 | > 67 | > 79 |
| > 56 | > 68 | > 80 |
| > 57 | > 69 | > After 80 |
| > 58 | > 70 | > Don't know/not sure |
| > 59 | > 71 | > I don't plan to retire |
| > 60 | > 72 | |

Q17. Do you work full-time or part-time?

- | | |
|--------------------|--------------------|
| > I work full-time | > I work part-time |
|--------------------|--------------------|

Q17a. [For those that work part-time.] What is your work schedule, expressed as a percentage of what full-time partners at your firm are expected to work?

- | | | |
|-------|-------|-------|
| > 5% | > 40% | > 75% |
| > 10% | > 45% | > 80% |
| > 15% | > 50% | > 85% |
| > 20% | > 55% | > 90% |
| > 25% | > 60% | > 95% |
| > 30% | > 65% | |
| > 35% | > 70% | |

Q18. What is your gender?

- | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| > Female | > Prefer to self-describe |
| > Male | > Prefer not to say |
| > Non-binary/third gender | |

Q19. Which of the following statuses do you most closely associate with?

- | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------|
| > Heterosexual | > Prefer not to say |
| > Gay or lesbian | |
| > Bisexual | |
| > Prefer to self-describe | |

Q20. Which of these categories, used by the American Bar Association, best describes your ethnicity?

- White, not Hispanic
- Black, not Hispanic
- Hispanic
- Asian Pacific, not Hispanic
- American Indian, not Hispanic
- Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, not Hispanic
- Mixed races
- Prefer not to say

* * * * *

By hitting the Submit button, you will be completing this survey and submitting your responses to Acritas.

Thank you for participating in the Major, Lindsey & Africa Partner Compensation Survey. For Managing Partners and members of firm management who want a more detailed briefing on the results of this survey, please contact Jeffrey Lowe, Global Practice Leader, Law Firm Practice and Managing Partner, Washington, D.C., at jlowe@mlaglobal.com or 202-628-0661. To learn more about Major, Lindsey & Africa, visit www.mlaglobal.com.



©2020 Major, Lindsey & Africa LLC.
All rights reserved.
An Allegis Group Company.

WWW.MLAGLOBAL.COM